

XX
 Flood and Iron is devoted to multi-player wargames, especially
 Diplomacy variants. Subscription 8/\$1, sample issue 15¢ from the
 editor-publisher, Lewis Pulsipher, 329 Twin Towers, Albion, Michigan
 49224. BI is affiliated with the Michigan Organized Wargamers and
 its games are guaranteed by that group. This is Orion Press #34.
 XX

1. Pastafazoola! Despite my efforts this looks like another big issue, and BI 15 will be 12 pages if I can overcome the production problems of Dick Vedder's variant 1776. If I do, there will be no discussion of IDA in BI 15, so everyone will have to wait for #16 for their next turn at bat. And if I can help it, #16 will be very short. I may hold on to 16 and mail it to traders and subbers with 17.

2. January is Be Kind to Tim Tilson Month. And February will be Be Kind To Edi Birsan Month.

3. Ray Bowers, 625 Evans, Kirkwood, Mo. 63122 has published the first issue of a Diplomacy Census containing names and addresses of virtually all Diplomacy players and publishers. I've noticed a number of inactive players and old addresses for Michiganders, but that must be expected. One issue is 30¢, sub 4/\$1.

4. Len Lakofka is setting up a syndicate for distribution of polls concerning various aspects of Diplomacy. Results of a Diplomacy 'zine poll are in Vox Populi #1. The first three issues cost 3 8¢ stamps from Len at 4970 N. Marine Dr. Apt. 525 Chicago, Ill. 60640. Note that some categories are fairly inaccurate since they are Len's own determinations -- for example, Boast is given a frequency rating of "some minor delays" when it is actually as prompt as Graustark.

5. IDA election results (from Liaisons Dangereuses 40). President, Edi Birsan; Editor, John Boyer; At Large Secretaries (I believe this means Council members): Beyerlein and Biehl; Midwest Regional Secretary, Chic Hilliker; which are all I care about. As Birsan says, at least he won't be Ombudsman any more; the Council will have to decide what to do about that post, since the constitution apparently doesn't provide for resignations. I am glad that Beyerlein and Hilliker were elected, and perh s I would have voted for Biehl if I had known him.

6. The old Xenogogic is dead. Larry Peery is converting it to a slick-production 'zine, to be published quarterly for \$1.25 an issue, which will act as a forum for communication among various gaming groups such as Dippy players, miniatures players, government simulation gamers, etc. I'd like to hear from someone who sees the first issue when it appears. Among the promised authors are Lyndon Baines Johnson and (I think) Margaret Chase Smith. Box 8416, San Diego, Calif. 92102.

7. IFW is still struggling along. I recently received a membership list, and the June and July issues of the IW (though according to the two-page notice with the list, some members did not receive the June and July issues). Apparently the April and May IW's disappeared in the mails, and IFW is making a claim against the postal service. It should be interesting to see how things develop. Apparently Len Lakofka will not be running for President, but this is not stated definitely.

Variant Game Designations

72Aibu. Youngstown Variant. Richard Walkerdine, Mad Policy.
Austria-Andrew Waldie, China-David Christianson, England-John Meadon, France-Duncan Morris, Germany-Howell Davies, India- John Morrison, Italy-John Piggott, Japan-Graham Happe, Russia-Andy Davidson, Turkey-Michel Feron.

72AJt. Middle Earth Diplomacy IV. Herb Barents, Stench. Angmar-Gray Graber, Arnor-Paul Wood, Gondor-Barry Eynon, Harad-Dean Schw. Mordor-Walt Buchanan, Rhovanion-Chic Hilliker.

I think that takes care of all the 72 games. The first 73 game, Adi is the Anarchy IV game below.

73Adi

This game began by carbon copy letter on January 2.

Winter 1900

Bel-StP-vie (David Sleight) Build A StP, A Vie, F Bel
Bre-Con-Swe (Harley Jordan) Build A Con, F Bre, F Swe
Den-Par-Sev (Paul Wood) Build F Den, A Sev, A Par
Edi-Gre-Ven (Barry Eynon) Build A Ven, A Gre, F Edi
Hol-Liv-Tri (Richard Hull) Build A Liv, F Hol, A Tri
Kie-Smy-Spa (Dean Schwass) Build F Spa sc, A Smy, A Kie
Mun-Por-Rom (Tom Keller) Build F Por, A Rom, A Mun

Spring 1901 moves are due Friday February 9 at noon at 329 Twin Towers, Albion, Michigan 49224. The phone is (517) 6299451. That's for the entire dorm, so you'll get an answer even if I'm not around. In general you will have to contact me directly if you want to phone in moves, since I want to avoid phone forgery in every possible way. I much prefer written orders, and am not responsible for mistakes in transcription of phone orders.

72.9h

1939 attacks: USA (Campion), France (Hendry), and Britain (Caton), no attacks. Russia (Eynon): Vs. Fra in Ger 1-1, no effect. Vs. Bri in Rus 1-1, no effect. Vs. Bri in Pol 1-1, X. Germany (Birsan): Vs. Bri in Ger 3-1, X. Vs. Bri in Rom 3-1, X. Vs. USA in Pol 2-1 no effect.

	Al	Au	Ba	Br	Cz	Ge	It	Po	Rh	Ro	Ru	US	Fr
USA								7				18	
FRA	C			U		U+3		U		U			2
BRI											U+9	U+3	U
RUS			C	U+2		U+4				1	24		
GER		C	C		C	16		14	C	4			

France places understandings in Poland and Romania. Britain places understanding in France. France is at the end of the list again. Sigh. 1940 Placements (the last year, remember) are due as for 73Adi above.

72.23h

1937 Placements.

USA (Eynon) 2-Al, 2-Cz, 2-Pol.
FRA (McHoull) 5-Ge, 3-Al.
BRI (~~Lipson~~ Caton) 6-Ge, 5-Ru, 1-Cz.
RUS (Van De Graaf) 10-Rus.
GER (Roseman) 20-Al.

Elliot Lipson missed again and is replaced by John Caton, since Jim Gac also missed. Thank you, John.

	Al	Au	Ba	Br	Cz	Fr	Ge	It	Po	Rh	Ro	Ru	US
USA	2				4				6				
FRA	8				2		5		2				
BRI					5		U+6		U			5	
RUS			C								C	13	
GER	23	C								C			

1937 attacks are due as for 73Adi.

I have Gac, Sleight, Hyduke, and Roseman signed up for historical Origins. In accordance with the house rules, if the game is filled within five weeks without need for Gac, he will not be able to play (Gac and Roseman live, I think, in the same local phone area). Otherwise he will be able to. If it is filled soon I will open a fourth game for Gac (or Roseman can withdraw from the third...).

Schwass and Roseman are on the Anonymity III list, with some others showing interest.

Paul Wood is on the list for 4000AD, with two others showing interest.

NEW VARIANTS

The Tangelo Express #3 contains rules for United States Diplomacy and Everywhere Diplomacy, which are essentially the Reinsel Variant as reported last issue and generalized rules for this type of variant for any map (Moses Game reported last issue is one example).

11-man Variant, by Fred Winter, adds Spain, Poland, Sweden, and the Barbary States to the regular game. Some neutrals are armed, a few can become home centers for their owners, and a few must be garrisoned. Rules otherwise generally follow the regular game. The map I have, from Carbon 13 #II.1, is inadequate, but the map with the full set of rules (which are 16¢) apparently takes care of the problems. Box 604, Madison, Wis. 53703.

@ @ @ @

I should place "argaming is..." here, but I will put it off. Read that before you read my comments to the following letter, though.

Edi Birsan, c/o R. Verteramo, RD 5 Box 6 Bridge St., Hopewell Jct. NY

First off I don't appreciate being called overaggressive and tending toward dictatorial action. What I have done as Ombudsman is to make decisions between alternatives and views presented to me by people complaining about one thing or another. I make no claim to all powerful righteousness and I fully expect to be slapped down periodically when I overextend my bounds in the attempt to find out what they are.

Second; we have a basic difference in our conception of the IDA. You insist on an organization that is weak and incapable of providing services to players beyond the simplest regulatory matters such as the Boardman numbers. I take a more dynamic view on the organization and hope to continually expand the IDA into services for the players beyond record keeping and the like. This also explains our different views on the Ombudsman. You see him as a minor character powerless to act beyond verbal attempts at a meeting of minds. I see the office as a powerful one in which players finally have someone to go to in order to counter the forces available to the GM.

Third; I've said it before and I have to say it again and again until its straight in everyone's mind; NO SANCTIONS OR ORGAN-

IZATIONAL ACTION CAN BE TAKEN WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE COUNCIL. Do you understand that? Am I being unclear? Can you not see that this is the great check on the Ombudsman?

Fourth; The Ombudsman would be a fool to rule on hypothetical cases as he would be crushed by an avalanche of them each more absurd than the one before.

Fifth; you stated on 6 of BI 13: "Only if all parties to a dispute ask for compulsory arbitration should the Ombudsman make a "ruling" and expect it to be followed." If you had read the issues of OM closely you would have seen that in the case of Barents vs Peery this is the exact description of the matter. Peery and Herb both came to me for a ruling, both agreed to abide by my decision; I made the decision and then in deed and word changed his acceptance of the ruling. Thus I asked for the Council to impose sanctions against him.

Sixth; the means by which I come to a decision are locked up behind my 7 years of playing experience over 70 games and my year of publishing as well as my individual psychology. I don't claim to be all knowing, but I designed the office of the Ombudsman so that when action was taken the Council would like (sic) a jury on the actions to be taken.

Seventh; The Ombudsman should be the natural person to make interpretations of the Constitution as he heads the Judiciary Committee; but anyone can make them on the Council and present his views as was done in the Council meeting by Boyer, Peery, and Lakof. I personally have been making them because I find that I'm in the distinct minority of having read the Constitution in the first place which gives me an edge over most others who attempt to interpret the Constitution. Basically it's the tolerance of the Council that makes for the interpretation's validity.

Eighth; I think we have spent enough time on all this and now we should both get to work on building the type of IDA each of us would like. OK?

Before I make my comments I'd like to make something clear about the production of this 'zine. Most of the material is typed extemporaneously, sometimes from notes. In recent issues only the 4000 AD review, the letter to Diplomacy Review, the article concerning IDA and sanctions, and the first couple pages of my reply to Larry Peery in BI 9/10 were fully drafted before typing. Also, I have a mental block against proof reading, but I type while looking at the keyboard.

OK. I called you that because I believe it true, and nothing you have said has changed my mind. Someone else said that you were too headstrong, which is not so much different from what I said. And let me forestall any notion that it is just the Evil Michiganans who disagree with you (along with Peery, of course). The "headstrong" comment comes from outside our little blemish in the map which I know is so dear to you, Edi.

Apparently you don't recognize someone trying to "slap" you down even though you expect it. I may not be a member of the Council, but I am a member of the IDA and perhaps my opinion counts for a little.

Second. Yes, I'm aware of the basic difference, though of course I wouldn't put it in the biased terms you have used. The Ombudsman should be powerless UNLESS PARTICIPANTS IN A DISPUTE GIVE HIM POWER. This can be accomplished when the participants agree to compulsory arbitration, OR when the participants are members of

some group(s) through which they voluntarily agree to accept the ruling of the Ombudsman. But simply being members of IDA does not include such voluntary agreement. In other words, the IDA (not just the Ombudsman) has NO right to interfere in a dispute, or in ANY SORT OF ACTIVITY, without the voluntary agreement of the participants. Obviously you believe that the IDA has some right to interfere, and that is where our ways part. I want to be sure that the IDA will not stick its collective nose in my business. You'll notice that I have mentioned that I would resign from IDA if IDA membership implies, by some alchemy, a voluntary acceptance of the right of the Ombudsman to make rulings such that the Council may be asked to impose sanctions if the rulings are not followed. But I don't think membership does imply this; do you, or don't you think it matters? Players, if they are made aware of the problems they may encounter, can take care of themselves; if they can't, that's too bad. Perhaps those who don't want any trouble could participate only in IDA games in which the rulings of the Ombudsman, as judged by the IDA Council, are law. I will get back to organizational philosophies shortly.

Third, it should be clear now that it does not matter to me, in the final reckoning, whether one man or ten decide to impose sanctions. I don't care whether the entire IDA votes to impose sanctions; I don't think they have any right now, and never will so far as I am concerned because I will not join any organization which includes voluntary submission to the decisions of the Ombudsman. Voluntary, voluntary. Is it clear? I've already said it a number of times.

While I'm at it I would like to observe that I think that, even though the Ombudsman is checked by the Council, he is too powerful. As you say yourself, you want a powerful Ombudsman, and apparently think you can have one despite Council superiority. It appears that the Ombudsman's "rulings" are that, until someone challenges them by refusing to obey, so that the case must then be brought before the Council. Or perhaps the offender may ask the Council to decide whether the Ombudsman's "ruling" is correct before he must take the step of disobeying. I hope so. I would not like to have it known that I was disobeying the IDA (people will certainly confuse IDA and Ombudsman, of course), even if I was ultimately right. The Ombudsman has the power of publicity, which I'm sure you're aware of, Edi, so that he can do a lot of damage. But I digress.

Fourth, I do not think the Ombudsman must rule on all or no hypothetical cases. Why not just on ones that seem important and may establish a precedent for people to follow before someone gets hurt?

Fifth, if YOU had read Councilatory Notes, you would know that Peery claims that he accepted the Ombudsman's ruling in a specific instance, but not, apparently, as a general rule to be followed in every such instance. I assume that you, naturally, assumed that your ruling would be followed in every instance of that sort, while Peery, just as naturally, assumed it would apply only in one situation. Unless it was clearly determined beforehand that Peery would accept the ruling in all such cases, then we do not have a case such as I referred to in my statement, do we? I am not surprised that you and Peery misunderstood each other, or that in a pioneer case like this, the proceedings lack clarity (assuming this is actually the case -- I suppose we would have to see the relevant letters to be sure).

Seventh: I do not object to interpretation by the Ombudsman as long as it is understood that the Council has the final determination. I object, however, to the attitude -- that of telling the Council how things should be, rather than of suggesting that the Council should adopt your particular interpretation. My comments which you don't appreciate (your first paragraph) concern attitude, and in the interpretation business your attitude is objectionable to me. Sixth: perhaps as a matter of what can be accomplished, one must accept the opinion of one person in "judicial" matters. I prefer that the Council or some other group of persons at least review rulings of the Ombudsman, but this might take too much time and waste too much energy.

Eighth: There are a number of things I would like to see IDA become, and a number that I do not want it to become. The latter is more important to me. And since, apparently, you want it to become some of the things I do not want it to become, we can not both succeed in building the type of IDA we want. That's unfortunate but I see no alternative. So I will have to continue to oppose you and your objectives. What else can I do? I do not want IDA to bother independents and other groups in any way; let IDA take care of its own, and may it be sure that its own know what they're getting into. I speak as an independent, though a member of IDA, and as a member of another group, MOW (though not as a spokesman). MOW is much farther along in attempts to regulate the actions of its players and GM's, though we do not have any provisions for sanctions against GM's (except for expulsion from postal games, perhaps). MOW is just such a weak regulatory group as you despise, apparently (your paragraph two), yet you might be surprised to find that such a group can accomplish quite a bit; more, much more, than IDA has accomplished. Individuals working together without actual duties, and without need for coercion of any sort, can accomplish an amazing variety and amount of services. MOW, for example, maintains a list of Michigan gamers (over 400 now), and IDA could do the same, but for now Ray Bowers does it independently with the initial help of some other individuals, including the pioneer work of Walt Buchanan. ((Cop -- make that the same for Diplomacy players.)) Whether IDA is dynamic or regulatory makes no difference -- the job could have been done. Even now IDA can perhaps help Bowers out if it wishes, by making people aware of the effort and asking them to help. And again, IDA can form within itself a group similar to the MOW GM group, which would sanction GM's, perhaps, and guarantee games. The IDA does not need to "dynamically" impose itself on the rest of Dippydom. Let IDA tend to its own; if it is good, the rest of Dippydom will ultimately go along, don't you think? One of the problems of some of the IDA leaders is that they have preconceived views of "how things should go" in an organization, and don't bother to examine previous organizations to learn from their experiences. IFW, SIGL, MOW, and many other organizations have addressed themselves to problems which IDA faces, yet some IDA leaders are either so ignorant or so intellectually conceited that they believe that most of what they are doing is new and unique. I don't know whether Edi fits that category -- I hope not. I believe it's John Boyer who customarily praises IDA as a new and unique effort. But I KNOW that almost all of the IDA leaders do not avail themselves of opportunities to determine whether someone else, before, might have found a satisfactory solution to whatever problems arise, and that is certainly an intellectual conceit.

The following is a list of all variant postal Diplomacy openings known to me as of January 20, 1973 for North America.

Anschluss, Joe Antosiak, 422 East Ave., Lagrange, Ill. 60525.

Germany Vs. the World for \$4, which includes map and rules (available separately for 25¢). Also has openings for Origins of W II.

Stench, Herb Barents, 157 State St., Zeeland, Mich. 49464.

Youngstown Variant for \$2 game deposit (that is, a fee which is refunded at the end of the game, or when you are eliminated, if you don't resign or drop out) and a sub to the 'zine (9/\$1). MOW guarant.

Pellucidar, Burt Labelle, Forest Park #23, Biddeford, Maine

04005. Youngstown Variant for \$5. Also regular Diplomacy openings.

SPQR, James Massar, 127 N Emmons St., Darnemora, NY 12929.

Any variant, but he is especially trying to fill Youngstown Variant and SE Asia '56, for sub (\$1 per year plus postage) and \$3 game deposit (the latter may be incorrect -- check with Massar).

Crush, Karl Pettis, 520 W McDonel Hall, MSU, East Lansing, Michigan 48823. Youngstown Variant, for \$1 game deposit plus sub (8/\$1). Also openings for regular Diplomacy.

Shaafth, Andy Phillips, 128 Oliver St., Daly City, Calif. 94014.

Any variant, but especially Continent, for \$1 game deposit plus sub (8/\$1) plus \$1 sub deposit in case your sub expires before you are able to renew it.

Blood and Iron, Lewis Pulsipher, 329 Twin Towers, Albion, Mich. 49224. Anonymity III for \$1 game deposit plus sub (8/\$1). Also openings for Origins of W II, 4000AD. MOW guarantee.

Carbon 13, Fred Winter, Box 604, Madison, Wis. 53703. Winter 11-man variant for \$6.

Thunderbird, Mark Weidmark, 528 Park Crescent, Pickering, Ontario CANADA. Atlantica for \$4.

2

The following is a list of all Diplomacy variant rules available in North America as of January 20, 1973, to my knowledge. In some cases I am uncertain that I have listed the correct cost, or that the rules are available at all, and have indicated so with "(?)"

Hypereconomic Diplomacy II \$1 (?) from Peter Ansoff, Box 5798 Station B, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 37203. (?) The granddaddy of all variants, with extremely detailed economics (arsenals and shipyards are used, as well as gold factors), a world organization, countless on- and off-board countries, etc.

Middle Earth Diplomacy IV, 15¢ from Lew Pulsipher. A very old variant, but still popular. Based vaguely on Tolkien's Lord of the Rings, but set early in the Third age. Few changes in rules, but a new board. Six players. May also be available from Herb Barents.

Scotice Scripti III, John Boyer, 117 Garland Dr., Carlisle, Pa. 17013, 25¢. Four Irish and four other countries battle over Ireland, western and northern Britain, and environs, in the 11th century. Basically regular rules with new board.

Legion, 30¢ from John Ostapovich, 3520 Chimney Swift Dr., Huntingdon Valley, Pa. 19006. Based on Second Punic War, with Rome, Carthage, Macedonia, Syria, and Egypt playing. There are many changes in the economics, but few others.

Winter 11-man game, 16¢ from Fred Winter. Adds Spain, Poland, Sweden, and Barbary States to regular game. Some neutrals have special characteristics, such as civil disorder armies, but rules otherwise generally follow the regular game.

Winter 9-man game, 8¢ from Fred Winter. Adds Spain and Sweden to regular game. It is impossible to eliminate a player, and draws are difficult to achieve, if not practically impossible. Neutrals again have some special characteristics.

SE Asia '56, 15¢ from James Massar. Regular rules with new board for seven SE Asian countries

War of the Rings Diplomacy I and II, 40¢ from Jeff Key, 7918 Alpha Rd., Apt. 1153, Dallas, Tex. 75240 (?). Also available, but with a small distorted conference map, from Stan Wrobel, 7 Poland Village Plvd., Poland, Ohio 44514 (?).

Continent, 2nd edition, ? from Andy Phillips. Six countries of South America participate using most of the regular rules.

Brave New World, map only, ? from Andy Phillips. Game uses regular rules, perhaps with one exception, so map is sufficient. Game takes place in Europe, but new countries, such as Checko-Ukraine, are added to the powers of post-W II. Large number of centers.

Atlantica, 15¢ from Mark Weidmark or free to those interested in playing in Thunderbird. US, CSA, Canada, Italy, Germany, France, and England participate. Regular rules are generally used.

Cline 9-man game, ? from Conrad von Metzke, Box 8342, San Diego, Calif. 92102. Adds Barbary States and Persia to regular board with regular rules.

Jihad, ? from Dick Vedder, 1450 N Cherry Ave. Tucson, Ariz. 85719. Game begins in 622 AD with Arab and Germanic invasions of Europe. Player countries have different capabilities and different victory criteria. Includes Arab, German, Byzantine, Persian, Frankish, Lombard, and Spanish players.

Americana 1860, ? from Richard Hull, 4720 Cloyne Apt. #2, Oxnard, Calif. 93030 (in Tangelo Express #2). The US is divided into five areas in a hypothetical civil war. Fleets may travel in the Great Lakes and major rivers. Fewer units than the regular game.

United States Diplomacy and Everywhere Diplomacy, ? from Richard Hull (in Tangelo Express #3). US Dippy is a specific example of using the Everywhere rules, which can be used with any map which is divided into land areas (fleets are not used). Players pick home centers by preference, and play generally follows the regular rules.

Middle Earth Diplomacy II, 15¢ from Lew Pulsipher. Another Tolkien variant, similar to ME IV but with five countries (Gondor, Mordor, Rhovanion, Rohan, Arnor).

Interstellar Diplomacy I and II, 20¢ from Lew Pulsipher. A "space" wargame with few similarities to the regular game. The board is an area map of the Galaxy, three-dimensional in the center. The economic system is a second or third generation variation of Diplomacy; supply centers are not used, but each space is assigned an economic factor. The only unit is the space fleet, and more than one fleet may occupy a space. Not recommended for novices.

Mordor Vs. The World III, 20¢ from Lew Pulsipher. Based on the War of the Rings, with Mordor much stronger than any other country (the other four are the same as in ME II). Uses double and triple armies. The lack of balance ruins the game, unfortunately.

Hyborian Age Diplomacy, 20¢ from Lew Pulsipher. Based on Robert E. Howard's Conan series, specifically the period after Conan leaves the Hyborian world and the Turanians begin to rise. Five players: Turan, Stygia, Aquilonia, Nemedia, and a confederation of central states. Uses double armies which also move one or two spaces per turn, and fleets which may move two spaces per turn.

World War IV Diplomacy, 15¢ from Lew Pulsipher. Playing area is the world south of a line through the Mediterranean, except for Japan and environs which is also included. Depicts a world war after a nuclear holocaust has destroyed the present-day powers. Players are Australia, Japan, Egypt, Brazil, India, and South Africa. Uses regular rules.

Militarism I, 20¢ from Lew Pulsipher (very few copies left). An attempt to create a more realistic game using the regular board. Many rule changes, and quite complex. This is an ancestor of a World War II variant I am working on.

Anarchy IV, available along with Mil I. Using the regular board and rules, players are assigned three home centers at random.

Don Miller, 12315 Judson Rd., Wheaton, Md. 20906 has some variants still available. Contact him for a list.

Diadochi I is available from Hartley Patterson, Finches, 7 Cambridge Rd., Beaconsfield, Bucks, United Kingdom. Based on the Second Punic War, it resembles Jihad in many respects. Imperialism IXR is also probably available from Hartley. Based on the Peloponnesian War, with nine players and variable victory criteria. John Piggott, Jesus College, Cambridge CB5 8BL United Kingdom may have rules for Third Age, which is an improvement of the Mordor Vs. the World games.

Other variants are available from Europeans, but I have not been keeping record of them.

Fred Davis Jr., 5307 Carriage Ct., Baltimore, Md. 21229 may still have rules for Atlantica, Abstraction, and Germany Vs. the World, for 50¢ each or all three for \$1. Abstraction involves the same area and countries as the regular game, but some rules are changed for added realism and each country includes another center. Germany Vs. the World is a five or six player game (depending on whether the World War II or World War I version is played). There are many more units than in the regular game, and the board is changed quite a bit. Germany is much stronger than any of the other player-countries, especially in the World War II version. GVTW is also available from Joe Antosiak for 25¢.

Last we have the Youngstown Variant, most popular of all postal variants with almost 20 games started, although only two have been finished in the five years YV has been around. It also seems to be the most popular FTF variant. China, Japan, and India are added to the regular board, slightly altered so that each of the old powers has four units except Russia, which has six. There is a total of 72 centers. Rules are available from Mark Weidmark for 25¢, Andy Phillips for 30¢, Burt Labelle(?), Herb Barents (?), and perhaps Paul Wood, 24613 Harmon, St. Clair Shores, Mich. 48080.

@

And now we finally come to a short version of

WARGAMING IS JUST A GODDAM HOBBY

As some of you know, I've borrowed the title from science fiction fandom, in which there are those who treat fandom as a hobby, and those who treat it as a way of life. But in wargaming the "opposition" for the hobbyist is the "professional." With increasing frequency in recent months GM's have had to remind their players that they are not GMing as a profession, and that they don't make money from their GM activities. A few years ago virtually all Diplomacy players accepted this as a matter of course, but apparently today many of the new players believe that the GM should perform a "job" with perfection, and that he should be at the call of the players. For

(continued from page 6)

I'm told by an MOWer who sent Fred Winter the MOW info sheet that even he ("organization is the first sign of decay") likes MOW. Yet for all our lack of organization, we get a lot done. And we don't bother non-members...nor do we impose upon them unless they are already aware of what can occur (which at present means that our by laws state that an MOW member who drops out of a postal game will automatically be dropped from all MOW games, and that members of the GM group must abide by certain rules). I hope the point has not been lost in my wandering: that a weak regulatory organization can accomplish an amazing amount in a short time.

Just a hunch, Edi -- are you a Democrat? One who voted for Ni

example, one of Paul Wood's players sent in an address change a number of times, and then berated Wood for not notifying other players. But Wood had not published during the interval! The player was apparently vindictive in his complaint, and while that wouldn't bother some of us, other GM's are losing interest because of players like this. They expect professional GMing, and that's something that hobbyists who charge reasonable game fees cannot provide. Edi Birsan, I am afraid, is one of the people who expects "professional GMing. I recall one "ruling" he mentioned which used the word "professional" with regards to standards of GMing. And this is what frightens me: I fear that IDA will attempt to impose "professional GMing standards on hobbyists, with the result, if IDA is successful, that the hobbyist GM's will give up. A few years ago, most players did not mind an occasional delay in publication, even a long one, as long as the GM did not make a habit of it. But now many players seem to think that a GM should maintain his schedule strictly, without fail. And apparently IDA may go along with the wishes of the new players who favor "professionalism," albeit at hobbyist prices. It is the GMs who need protection as much or more than the players, despite the apparent power of the GM's and impotence of individual players.

I do not advocate "all power to the GM." I disagree with Larry Peery that a GM can throw a player out of a game because he does not like his conduct (Peery said that he would have removed Herb Barents even if he had not resigned because Herb had lost his temper, used obscenities -- in Peery's words, "conduct and language unbecoming to one of my players and, more importantly, unacceptable to me as a Publisher." It seems to me that this comes down to, "I don't like this guy's attitude so I'm kicking him out." I don't see how any publisher can support this view any more than a publisher could support a "professional" view of GMing, but this is not the first time a player has been thrown out of a game for non-House rule acts.

This will have to be continued nextish.

Lewis Pillsipher
329 Twin Towers
Albion, Michigan 49224

FIRST CLASS

First class

RICHARD MULL
4720 CLOYNE APT #2
OXNARD, CALIF. 93030

JAN
22

